

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed June 16, 2003, Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 USC §102 as anticipated by Zheng (USP 5,467,794).

Claims 1-10 have been canceled, and new claims 11-30 include similar elements to the canceled claims. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections by submitting the new claims to clarify the invention.

Applicant submits herewith a proposed drawing change to Figures 1 and 4 showing the flaps 48 as set forth in the specification.

Prior Art Rejections - 35 USC §102

A rejection under §102 requires that the cited reference teach all the claimed elements.

Claim 11

The present invention provides a tent with extendable windows.

Claim 11 recites:

A tent with at least one extendable window designed to increase usable space in the tent comprising:

a main structure including a plurality of walls oriented at a first angle with respect to a vertical reference; and

at least one window including a frame and screen extendable to a second angle with respect to a vertical reference, where the second angle is less the first angle and the extended window is substantially vertical;

whereby the tent has increased usable space when the window is extended.

The invention set forth in claim 11 is a tent designed to increase usable space by incorporating an extendable window. The window is extended from a tent wall to an angle that is substantially vertical (see Specification page 6 lines 4-21), which results in more usable space in the tent as well as an improved view.

Zheng describes a hyper-extended ceiling vent 110 having two screens 132 and 134 and a waterproof rain hood 118. Zheng does not teach or suggest creating more usable space in a tent since the internal screen 132 stays in place when the vent 110 is opened. Moreover, Zheng does

not teach or suggest a tent window that extends to a substantially vertical angle as required by the pending claims. Instead, Zheng shows a tent vent that extends to a substantially horizontal angle (see Figures 1 and 3), which is designed to keep rain out of the tent. Zheng teaches away from a substantially vertical window because such a window might allow rain to enter the tent, while the construction of the window in Zheng is intended primarily for rain protection (see waterproof hood 118, Figure 3).

Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection since Zheng does not teach or suggest the pending claims.

Claims 12-28

Claim 12 depends from claim 11 and further includes “an awning coupled to the main structure and the frame, and configured to hold the window in an extended orientation.” Zheng does not teach or suggest this awning in combination with the features from which these claims depend.

Claims 13-14 are dependent claims where “the frame includes a flexible pole; and the frame includes a sleeve into which the pole is positioned.” Zheng does not teach or suggest this awning in combination with the features from which these claims depend.

Claims 15-16 are dependent claims where “the awning is configured to hold the window frame in a substantially vertical orientation.” Zheng does not teach or suggest this awning in combination with the features from which these claims depend.

Claims 17-22 are dependent claims that further include “a lower attachment seam at a location below the midline of the main structure where a lower edge of the window attaches to the wall of the tent, which acts as a hinge mechanism, allowing the window to extend or retract.” Zheng does not teach or suggest this awning in combination with the features from which these claims depend.

Claims 23-28 are dependent claims where “the window includes a flap configured to selectively cover the window.” Zheng does not teach or suggest this awning in combination with the features from which these claims depend.

Claims 29-30

Claims 29-30 are similar to claims 11-28, but include additional limitations in the independent claim 29. Claim 29 requires that the tent have a plurality of windows that extend to a substantially vertical orientation. Applicant submits that these features are not taught or suggested by Zheng.

Conclusion

Applicant submits new claims to clarify the invention. Applicant submits that the pending claims are not taught or suggested by the references. For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims.

If any matters can be resolved by telephone, Applicant requests that the Patent and Trademark Office call the Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

Customer No. 32,986
IP Strategy Group (IPSG, P.C.)
10121 Miller Ave, Suite 201
Cupertino, CA 95014
Tel: 408-257-5500
Fax: 408-257-5550

Respectfully submitted,

By: DAVID C. ASHBY
David C. Ashby
Reg. No. 36,432